

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 5, 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the U.S. patent to Miller.

Claims 1 and 10 are objected to as being in improper form. At the same time, claims 14-16 are allowed, and claims 6-8 are considered as allowable.

The Examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 14-16 has been gratefully acknowledged. In connection with this, these claims have been retained substantially as they were. At the same time, a minor correction has been made in these claims. Claims 14, 15 and 16 correspond to original claims 6, 7 and 8 and include the features of the intervening claims. It should be mentioned that in the original claims, claim 3 was erroneously indicated as dependent on claim 2, which actually defines a non-existent combination. The supporting bearing does not contain simultaneously at least one rod-shaped bearing element and at least one band-shaped bearing element. As described on page 6, fourth paragraph of the specification, the embodiment of figure 5 and 6 was intended to be an alternative embodiment. Because the rod-shaped

elements (18) are flexible in x and y directions, they function as a floating bearing instead of a movable bearing, being movable in only one direction as described for example on page 4, last paragraph and page 5, last paragraph. Original claim 2 was directed to a floating bearing and original claim 3 was directed to a movable bearing.

It is therefore incorrect to combine the rod-shaped bearing element (18) of figures 5 and 6 with a band-shaped bearing elements (5, 6) of figures 3 and 4. It was originally intended to make claim 3 dependent on claim 1 without an intermediate dependency on claim 2. Claims 14 and 15 have been therefore amended with the present Amendment to exclude the features of claim 2. It is believed that claims 14-16 should be considered as allowable.

With the present communication applicants submitted a new set of claims 17-31.

Claims 17 and 23 combine the features of claims 13 with 6 and 13 with 7, and do not include the feature of the rod-shaped bearing element for the reasons specified hereinabove. Claims 17 and 23, similarly to claims 14 and 15, define that the fastening device (4) has the function of a moveable bearing and not at the same time also the function of a floating bearing as described with respect to the rod-shaped elements on page 6, line 31 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 23 should also be considered as being allowable.

As for claims 18-31, these claims depend directly or indirectly on claims 17 and 23, they share their allowable features, and therefore they should be allowed as well.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is believed that all the claims currently on file should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should

the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233